DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 324 711 CS 507 280

AUTHOR Elmes-Crahall, Jane
TITLE A Rhetorical Criticism-Women's Studies Course: Exploring Texts and Contexts in the American Woman's Suffrage Movement.
PUB DATE 3 Nov 90
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (76th, Chicago, IL, November 1-4, 1990).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Area Studies; *Course Content; Critical Thinking; Females; Higher Education; Interdisciplinary Approach; Reading Materials; *Rhetorical Criticism; Rhetorical Theory; Social History; Speech Communication; Student Interests; Thematic Approach; *Womens Studies; Writing Assignments
IDENTIFIERS Feminist Criticism; Wilkes College PA; *Womens Suffrage

ABSTRACT

An undergraduate course in rhetorical criticism at Wilkes University incorporated a major component on the rhetoric of the American Woman's Suffrage Movement. Considerable time was devoted to critiquing "traditional" approaches to rhetorical criticism from a feminist perspective and to questioning the appropriateness of various methodologies for conducting criticism of the rhetoric of diverse groups. The relationship between rhetorical texts and historical contexts was a sustained theme throughout the course. Five major critical methodologies, including situational, argument, neo-Aristotelian, genre, and dramatistic perspectives were used to explore the rhetoric of women's suffrage. Additionally, students gained insight into historical context by conducting textual analyses. Emphasis was placed on locating and reading original texts and doing close textual analyses as a means of comprehending historical periods. (Sixteen references and three appendixes containing the course syllabus and in-class writing assignments are attached.) (KEH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED324711

A RHETORICAL CRITICISM-WOMEN'S STUDIES COURSE:

EXPLORING TEXTS AND CONTEXTS IN THE AMERICAN WOMAN'S SUFFRAGE MOVEMENT

BY

JANE ELMES-CRAHALL
DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATION
WILKES UNIVERSITY
WILKES-BARRE, PENNSYLVANIA 18766

A PAPER
PRESENTED TO THE SPEECH COMMUNICATION ASSOCIATION MEETING
CHICAGO,ILLINOIS
NOVEMBER 3, 1990

CS507280

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Jane Elmes-Crahall

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

THE RHETORICAL CRITICISM-WOMEN'S STUDIES COURSE: EXPLORING TEXTS AND CONTEXTS IN THE AMERICAN WOMAN'S SUFFRAGE MOVEMENT

One of the students in a recent Rhetorical Criticism class wrote on the student evaluation form: "I never realized how much I'd enjoy rhetorical criticism. It has changed the way I listen to political speeches and debates-just ask my boyfriend who will not watch the President's speeches with me anymore!"

Most of us would agree our purpose for teaching rhetorical criticism to undergraduates is to illuminate, not necessarily to spark interpersonal conflict between friends. However, what the student said makes the effort worthwhile. Another student concluded: "I no longer approach politics as if I'm in a fog. Now, it makes sense to me." My paper is written in the spirit of such student comments-when the rhetorical criticism course is taught as a central part of an undergraduate's core curriculum, the fog lifts and enables the student to comprehend public address with a fresh perspective. As Sonja Foss says in the preface to her book on rhetorical criticism, "It is an everyday activity that we can use to understand our responses to symbols of all kinds in our environment, to reject those with negative impacts, and to create symbols of our own to generate the kinds of responses we intend" (S. Foss, 1989, xi).

I have been fortunate enough to teach an undergraduate course in rhetorical criticism since 1975, first at Clarion University and now at Wilkes University. At Clarion, Rhetorical Criticism was a senior seminar that followed two lower-level courses-Introduction to Rhetorical Theory and Rhetoric of Conflict. At Wilkes, Rhetorical Criticism blends rhetorical theory and the practice of criticism. The only prerequisite is Public Speaking. It is a particularly challenging course for those of us who teach at small or moderately- sized institutions because we often make difficult decisions about what and how we teach. Unless it is a required course in the

speech communication curriculum, we are dependent upon several forces that are not entirely within our own control, including: attracting sufficient enrollment for what is likely to be a rigorous seminar course; convincing the department Chair and/or Dean that rhetorical criticism is just as vital to our students as courses in television production or public relations; and, as a teacher finding the balance of theory and application, between knowledge and ability.

Why is it worth the effort to teach rhetorical criticism to undergraduates? My answer to that question probably reflects the unique character of the speech communication curriculum at my institution. Forgive the metaphor, but for me the rhetorical criticism course can best be compared to an acrobatic activity. While teaching rhetorical criticism grounds me more solidly within the academic terrain because it has been such a part of my professional training, it tends to toss my students about a bit as they learn to suspend concepts of time and place-at least for a while. If I guide them well, when they are back on terra firma they will view discourse and how we respond to it in new, exciting ways. That is a challenge. But increasingly we must also face questions about how such courses fit within changing general education curricula. Suddenly academic "terra firma" begins to shift underfoot a bit.

Rhetorical Criticism as Central to the University's Core Curriculum

Like many of your institutions, Wilkes University adopted a revised general education curriculum several years ago. It stressed interdisciplinary courses, collaborative learning, and attempted to move us away from specialized, vocational curricula within academic departments. With renewed emphasis on fundamental "liberal learning", developing skills in critical thinking, writing and speaking became the task of many faculty rather than a few. The new core threatened some faculty, but provided many of us with an opportunity to demonstrate the centrality of our courses in the liberal arts curriculum. COM 300: Rhetorical Criticism was easily adapted to the list of writing and speaking intensive courses.

In addition to two required composition courses, students at Wilkes are required to take three upper-level "WI" or writing intensive courses. WI courses may be within the student's

major, or in another area. Faculty who teach WI courses must complete training in writing-across the curriculum and submit their syllabi to a campus-wide writing committee for review. Within the Department of Communication, many of our courses, including Rhetorical Criticism were granted WI status because of the course content.

Wilkes also adopted an Oral Performance Option requirement. Students may take an oral performance course such as Public Speaking, or select two "OPO" courses which require several sustained, extemporaneous oral presentations. Again, many of our courses, including Rhetorical Criticism, were granted OPO status because of course content.

And, last year Wilkes approved a Women's Studies minor. It is a 21-credit hour interdisciplinary minor, which permits students to enroll in five upper-level "WS" courses in their major course of study and in other disciplines. "WS"-designated courses "introduce students to the theoretical assumptions and historical developments of feminist thought." Because it is an interdisciplinary course of study, WS classes examine a variety of issues related to "race, gender, class, culture, sexuality, family, reproductive technology, language and discourse." WS courses emphasize the experiences and contributions of women throughout time, and recognize gender as a factor that has shaped intellectual traditions, political and social forces in society, and symbolic systems of expression. Faculty who wish to have a course designated "WS" must submit their syllabus to the Women's Studies Coordinating Committee, which develops guidelines for introducing gender as a significant component in the course design.

There are many other aspects of the new core requirements, but the writing requirement, oral performance option, and women's studies designation all applied to COM 300: Rhetorical Criticism. I should note that although women's studies is not a core requirement, many of the WS courses are among the options in a category of "Culture and Society" which emphasizes pluralism as an important part of society. As a member of the Women's Studies Coordinating Committee from the beginning, I have been able to "mainstream" gender issues into several upper-level communication courses. In 1988-89 I was asked to refine the syllabi and teaching

methods in existing communication courses as prototypes for WS courses. Interpersonal Communication, Rhetorical Criticism, and Intercultural Communication were identified for inclusion of a gender component. Faculty in English, sociology and economics also participated in the first round of WS courses. In my teaching rotation, Rhetorical Criticism was the first one of the communication courses to be adapted for possible WS designation. COM 300: Rhetorical Criticism, which was taught in the fall of 1989, will be discussed in this paper. The syllabus and several in-class assignments (not dealing with women's studies) are attached. Because the other members of this panel are dealing with rhetorical criticism as writing intensive and as a research course, I will focus my comments on the women's studies designation.

COM 300: Rhetorical Criticism is an upper-level elective which can be used to satisfy university requirements in writing, speaking, and cultural pluralism (as long as it justifies the women's studies designation). Within the Department of Communication, it is one of seven courses in the Rhetoric/Public Communication concentration, from which students select five. The course is taught every third semester. The Rhetoric/Public Communication concentration is the smallest of the five in our department, but is a frequent "second" concentration for those majoring in broadcasting or organizational communication. In addition, occasionally political science, English, and business majors with a minor in communication enroll as well. It has always been a small course-with 10-12 students enrolled in the seminar. Usually, about 80% are communication majors.

I point out the composition of the enrollment because I want to emphasize that a course in Rhetorical Criticism, as I teach it, will not be a "large draw" in student enrollment. There are ways to teach rhetorical criticism-primarily the thematic approaches-that permit broadening the enrollment. And, I suggest anyone interested in that approach might find Henry's and Sharp's article on "Thematic Approaches to Teaching Rhetorical Criticism" of interest (Communication Education, 38, July 1989). I find the seminar format to be most appropriate for the course as I teach it, and a maximum enrollment of 12 enables greater student-to-student and student-faculty

collaboration.

Rationale for a Feminist Perspective in Rhetorical Criticism Courses

Along with a growing number of rhetorical scholars, I consider it important to mainstream a feminist perspective in established communication courses. As Campbell wrote in her recent two-volume collection of texts of early American feminists, "Men have an ancient and honorable rhetorical history....Women have no parallel rhetorical history" (Campbell, 1989, 1). For those of us who teach rhetorical criticism, the absence of female voices in the texts we select for analysis is both an embarrassment and a failure of our discipline to acknowledge the importance of women's rhetoric to our history and today's society. Courses in rhetorical criticism are obvious choices for incorporating a gender component. They are courses which also are in greatest need of feminist revision. As teachers of rhetorical criticism, we are challenged not to teach from texts that exclude the rhetoric of women, or to perpetuate criticism that judges the discourse of women by means of historical bias or rhetorical neglect.

Campbell, Carter and Spitzack, and Foss all suggest ways to incorporate a feminist perspective in rhetorical theory and criticism. Campbell reminds us, "There is, as yet, nothing that can be clearly identified as feminist rhetorical criticism." She calls for "mainstreaming"- exploring how discourse by and about women can be integrated into rhetorical studies. Omission of works dealing with women has been harmful to rhetoric, according to Campbell, because "the rhetoric of outgroups is, comparatively speaking, more important for rhetorical criticism and theory" (Campbell, QJS, 1989, 212-213). Foss writes in her book on rhetorical criticism, "A feminist stance in rhetorical criticism...is one in which the critic believes that both women and men should have equal opportunities for self-expression and that women's perspectives should be an integral part of rhetorical practice and theory" (Foss, 1989, 154-155). That is a message we need to send to our students in what we teach and how we teach.

As the field of rhetorical criticism works hard to catch up with progress in feminist theory, those of us teaching undergraduates face a particularly difficult task. There really isn't a body of

feminist rhetorical theory, at least not yet. Several recently published essays provide excellent examples of feminist criticism. And Foss provides us with at least one textbook that incorporates the feminist approach to rhetorical criticism. However, when working with undergraduates in what is likely to be their first and only course in criticism, we often begin with classical and contemporary rhetorical theorists. How do we guide our students toward a non-exclusionary critical perspective when teaching theories and methodologies that ignored the contributions of women and other groups to rhetoric and history?

My answer to this question was to incorporate a major component on the rhetoric of the American Woman's Suffrage Movement into the syllabus for COM 300: Rhetorical Criticism. Approximately one-third of the course time was devoted to this unit. I should point out that the structure of the course deliberately calls for the use of a major social movement as the final major assignment. Previously, I used portions of the civil rights movement as a case study. Clearly, it takes a great deal of preparation time to adjust the course syllabus, but I enjoy the challenge. I attempt to provide enough situational information to enable students to understand contextual issues.

What is not so obvious is that considerable time was devoted to critiquing "traditional" approaches to rhetorical criticism from a feminist perspective. In my selection of texts for analysis by the class, and the careful inclusion of the feminist view point, I was able to raise questions about appropriateness of various methodologies for conducting criticism of the rhetoric of diverse groups. Quickly, some students noticed the absence of scholarly work dealing with women. One young man noted with surprise that some women were literate in Greece! Imagine his amazement to discover the solid legal reasoning of Susan B. Anthony's 1872 defense of the female citizen's right to vote. Eventually, students began noticing that certain theories made inherent assumptions about what texts were "worthy" of criticism. These small "discoveries" became an important part of our seminar's discussions. And, it was important to sensitize the students to the feminist perspective before the unit on woman's

suffrage.

I found the American Woman's Suffrage Movement to be a gold mine of rhetorical history. As a major social movement that lasted decades, it intersected other movements-abolition, temperance, and labor to mention a few. Key people influenced the movement from the mid-nineteenth century to the early twentieth century which permits charting the evolution argument by the same person within the movement. Because woman's suffrage was such a significant cultural movement, it is possible to study a wide range of responses to suffragists' rhetoric. And because the movement attracted such diverse orators, it allows the students to consider the issue of language and social class in advancing a cause. Perhaps there are two over-riding reasons for selecting the suffrage movement as a case study for rhetorical criticism. First of all, it contains a wealth of captivating discourse and orators-of interest to today's students because of the enduring central argument. And secondly, as an important part of America's history, the woman's suffrage movement invites close textual criticism.

Exploring Texts and Contexts in the American Woman's Suffrage Movement

Throughout the syllabus of COM 300 the relationship between text and context is presented as an interactive one. For example, the first essay students complete is a situational analysis of a current presidential speech. In the spring of 1987, we used President Reagan's State of the Union Address. In the fall of 1989, President George Bush cooperated by delivering his speech on the "War on Drugs" on September 5-one week after classes began. I introduced students to Bitzer's essay on rhetorical situation, and their first assignment was a paper which argued that the speech was (or was not) a "fitting response" to the situation. Other assignments, such as the analysis of argument and proof in the second Lincoln-Douglas debate at Freeport, Illinois also required discussion of how text and context interacted, and affected each other. Fortunately, research in rhetorical criticism has provided excellent examples of textual criticism of American public address. In particular, Michael Leff and Stephen Lucas have called for greater attention to textual criticism.

Lucas noted in his 1988 article in the Quarterly Journal of Speech there is "a resurgence of interest in the American oratorical tradition" (Lucas, 1988, 243). He recognized a "renewal of interest in oratory as a force in American history" (244) and a growing interest in "close analysis of rhetorical texts" (Lucas, 1988, 246). And Leff calls on students of rhetoric to "go beyond setting a speech in context".... "to probe its artistic coherence by attending to the action within the text-to the way elements condition one another within the life cycle of the performance" (Leff quoted in Lucas, 1988, 248). Both Leff and Lucas are concerned with "textual context." As Leff writes, "The rhetorical text...is a historical development occurring within a broader context of historical developments. However circumscribed by extrinsic events, the text retains an internal history of its own" (Leff, QJS, 1986, 385). Concerned with "the timing in the text," Leff and Lucas advocate close textual criticism. Leff claims "the central task of textual criticism is to understand how rhetorical action effects this negotiation [of text and time], how the construction of a symbolic event invites a reconstruction of the events to which it refers" (Leff, 1986, 385). The benefit of close textual analysis, according to Lucas, is "that it allows the critic, in essence, to slow down the action within the text so as to keep its evolving internal context in sharp focus and allow more precise explication of its rhetorical artistry" (Lucas, 1988, 249).

The issue of textuality is clearly an important one to rhetorical criticism. It is especially important at a time when our students have difficulty distinguishing between original texts and mediated realities. David Zarefsky points out many critics face the same confusion: "We are not sufficiently meticulous about using the available primary sources to understand a historical situation" (Zarefsky in Leff and Kauffeld, 1989, 24).

Locating "primary source material" for a course in rhetorical criticism can be difficult, especially if the instructor uses primary texts and not copies of essays written by others about original texts. It became a major investigative challenge in teaching the rhetorical criticism/women's studies course. Specifically, I tried to select texts for analysis that reflected a culturally diverse population, or addressed issues of concern to people from diverse

backgrounds. I wish I could say that was an easy task which involved turning to a pool of speech texts from which I could select rhetorical examples from a pluralistic society. However, few texts by or about women exist. And many of the ones that do exist are not readily available for instructional purposes.

Therefore, I had to do a great deal of work in the reference department of the Wilkes library. When I found the library holdings to be minimal at best, I spoke with the Head Librarian. Partially as a result of my experience with COM 300, a "bibliographic instructional" reference librarian has begun preparing supplemental bibliographies on various women's studies issues. The supplements list sources available at Wilkes, and two other college libraries in the city. I also decided to have the students include annotated bibliographies with their final papers in order to identify sources that should be purchased by Wilkes.

Throughout my preparation for the course, and the development of the Supplemental Bibliography for Resources Available on the American Woman's Suffrage Movement, I stressed the need to make complete texts available to the students. The search for accurate, complete texts became a vital part of the critical process. Students often worked as research teams. I am pleased to point out that the students did this on their own-perhaps as the most efficient way to complete a demanding research assignment. One team was formed because two students were researching the same orator-Ernestine Potowski Rose; another formed because several students were interested in different speakers at the same women's rights convention. In another case, three students were working together in reviewing the Congressional Record for texts of testimony by Carrie Chapman Catt, Victoria Claflin Woodhull, and Elizabeth Cady Stanton. One of the more interesting examples of collaborative research occurred when one student researching Frances Willard's rhetoric located a collection of lectures given at the Chautauqua, N.Y. Institute and discovered portions of texts given to that audience by Sojourner Truth. While Karlyn Korhs Campbell's collection of texts by early feminists provided the basis for textual material, almost all of the students were able to locate additional speech texts because of

their research efforts.

Thus, the matter of original and accurate texts became one of the best learning experiences in COM 300. The fact that they were locating source material that, as of this moment, has not yet appeared in published critical essays made the research important to my students and to what we know about this subject. In addition, they took seriously the invitation to add to our library's holdings.

In the beginning of the assignment, I attempted to sketch the context for the early stages of the movement. In doing so, I introduced the contributions of the earliest woman orators to present public lectures in the United States-Deborah Sampson Gannett and Maria Miller Stewart. When I discovered there is some disagreement about which woman actually gave the first public lecture, I began an investigation of my own on Deborah Sampson Gannett. My inquiry took me to the abundant private library of a good friend who is the senior member of the history department. Always intrigued with "that speech stuff" I do, he handed me several moldy books and we began looking for information on Deborah Sampson Gannett. In a book entitled Lost Men of American History I found verification of her six-city lecture tour in 1802, and a short biography of her colorful life as a female soldier in the American revolutionary war. We tracked down the act of Congress that awarded her heirs veterans benefits, and located two newspaper accounts of her speech given in Worcester, Massachusetts in 1802. I mention this anecdote for several reasons: (1) what I learned about Deborah Sampson in my colleague's office lead me to the complete text of her 1802 lecture given in Boston which I will use as the basis of a textual criticism; (2) my colleague persuaded me to include several radical women who were not mainstream supporters of the suffrage movement, such as Victoria Claflin Woodhull; and (3) we decided at some future date to team- teach a special topics course on the Rhetorical History of Individual Rights in the Nineteenth Century. Thus, by stressing research collaboration with my students, I fell into a very promising collaboration with a colleague in history. I know for a fact that he has a greater understanding and respect for what it is I do as a rhetorical critic.

One final observation about text-context is warranted. Because of the research teams and the in-class presentation of their findings, students began viewing texts as arguments or responses to arguments or new arguments which advanced the cause of woman's suffrage. As one student claimed Susan B. Anthony's 1872-73 speech on "Is It a Crime for a U.S. Citizen to Vote?" presented a new cogent legal argument for suffrage, another challenged that conclusion. The skeptical student found in her research on Victoria Woodhull that Ms. Anthony was present when Woodhull delivered her memorial to the Congressional Judicial Committee at least six months before Anthony advanced the same argument in her own speeches. I found such questions very healthy in a course on rhetorical criticism. Students began questioning the validity of what they read and started digging more into "background" information to learn how the speeches fit into their rhetorical contexts.

To summarize, the relationship between rhetorical texts and historical contexts was a sustained theme throughout the course. Five major critical methodologies, including situational, argument, neo-Aristotelian, genre, and dramatistic perspectives were used to explore the rhetoric of the American Woman's Suffrage Movement. Students gained insight into historical context by conducting textual analyses. Emphasis was placed on locating and reading original texts and doing close textual analyses as a means of comprehending historical periods. I found that students were better able to appreciate the role of rhetorical acts in transforming historical situations.

Final Research Papers on Woman's Suffrage Movement

The following is the list of orators/speeches students selected for their final term papers. You will notice that two students did the same orator-Ernestine Potowski Rose. While I initially resisted the duplication, considering the hundreds of speeches given by Mrs. Rose and the difficulty in locating full texts, I agreed.

Student	Topic
L. Balestrini	Angelina Grimke' Weld: "Address at Pennsylvania Hall

	on May 17, 1838"
K. Bauer	Sojourner Truth: "Speech at the Woman's Rights Convention, Akron, Ohio-1851" and excerpts from speeches delivered at the Chautauqua Institute
S. Gardner	Elizabeth Cady Stanton: "Speech at the National Woman's Rights Convention, 1852" and "Solitude of Self-Hearings before the House Committee on the Judiciary" on January 18, 1892
L. Eater	Ernestine Potowski Rose: "Speech at the National Woman's Rights Convention, in Worcester, Massachusetts,1852 or 1853"
S. Zolner	Ernestine Potowski Rose: "Speech at the National Woman's Rights Convention" and excerpts from lectures in New York in 1853
B. Jamelli	Victoria Claflin Woodhull: "A Lecture on Constitutional Equality delivered at Lincoln House in Washington, D.C., February 16, 1871"
C. Augustine	Susan B. Anthony: "Is It a Crime for a U.S. Citizen to Vote?", 1872-1873
T. Herman	Frances E. Willard: "A White Life for Two", 1890 and excerpts from lectures at the Chautauqua Institute
T. Griffith	Ida B. Wells: "Southern Horrors-Lynch Law in All It's Phases," October 5, 1892 in New York City
S. Davis	Anna Howard Shaw: "The Fundamental Principle of a Republic," 1915
K. Gromalski	Carrie Chapman Catt: "The Crisis" speech, Atlantic City, N.J., 1916

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Andrews, J., "Wise Skepticism: On the Education of a Young Critic," Communication Education, 38 (1989), 178-183.

Bineham, J., "Pedagogical Justification for a Theory-Method Distinction in Rhetorical Criticism," Communication Education, 39 (1990), 30-45.

Campbell, K.K., "The Sound of Women's Voices," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 75 (1989), 212-258.

Campbell, K.K. (Ed.). Man Cannot Speak for Her, Vol. I: A Critical Study of Early Feminist Rhetoric. New York: Praeger, 1989.

Campbell, K.K. (Ed.). Man Cannot Speak for Her, Vol. II: Key Texts of the Early Feminists. New York: Praeger, 1989.

Foss, S.K., "Rhetorical Criticism as the Asking of Questions," Communication Education, 38 (1989), 191-196.

Foss, S.K. Rhetorical Criticism: Exploration and Practice. Prospect Heights, Illinois: Waveland Press, 1989.

Golden, J., Berquest, G. and Coleman, W. (Eds.). The Rhetoric of Western Thought, 4th Edition. Dubuque,IO: Kendell-Hunt, 1987.

Gronbeck, B., "Rhetorical Criticism in the Liberal Arts Curriculum," Communication Education, 38 (1989), 184-190.

Henry, D. and Sharp, H., "Thematic Approaches to Teaching Rhetorical Criticism," Communication Education, 38 (1989), 197-204.

Leff, M.C. and Kauffeld, F.J. (Eds.). Texts in Contexts. Davis, CA: Hermagoras Press, 1989.

Leff, M.C., "Textual Criticism: The Legacy of G.P. Mohrmann," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 72 (1986), 377-389.

Lucas, S.E., "The Renaissance of American Public Address: Text and Context in Rhetorical Criticism," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 74 (1988), 241-260.

Medhurst, M., "Teaching Rhetorical Criticism to Undergraduates: Special Editor's Introduction," Communication Education, 38 (1989), 175-177.

Medhurst, M., "Rhetorical Criticism: Forensic Communication in the Written Mode," Communication Education, 38 (1989), 205-213.

Spitzack, C. and Carter, K., "Women in Communication Studies: A Typology for Revision," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 73 (1987), 401-423.

APPENDIX A

COURSE SYLLABUS
COM 300: Rhetorical Criticism

INSTRUCTOR: Jane Elmes-Crahall PHONE: Ext. 4162
OFFICE HOURS: MWF 11-12; T,TH 11-12; OFFICE: Capin 23
T,TH 8-9 A.M.; others by appointment.

REQUIRED TEXTBOOK: The Rhetoric of Western Thought, 4th Edition by Golden, J., Berquest, G., and Coleman, W. (Eds.). Kendell-Hunt, Pub., 1987, paperback.

The following materials were published too late to be ordered as texts. Two copies will be on reserve in the library. Required readings will be assigned from these books:

"Text of Second Lincoln-Douglas debate in Freemont, Illinois on August 27, 1858," in Lincoln: Speeches and Writings, 1832-1858, Vol. I by Roy P. Basler (Ed.), The Library of America Classics Publication, 1989 edition.

Karlyn Kohrs Campbell (Ed.), Man Cannot Speak for Her, Vol. II: Key Texts of the Early Feminists, NY: Praeger, 1989. (Selected readings)

COURSE DESCRIPTION: This course is designed to introduce historical and conceptual developments in rhetorical criticism. Critical methodologies, from classical to contemporary, will be applied to the analysis of the spoken word. Pre-requisite: Com 101: Public Speaking or permission of instructor. Please note that for the first time, COM 300 will satisfy two requirements in the new core: the upper-level Writing Intensive requirement and the OPO (oral performance option) requirement. In addition, COM 300 has been approved as an elective in the Women's Studies curriculum.

If you elect COM 300 as an OPO course, you must notify the instructor during the first week of class so the proper forms may be completed. If you plan to use COM 300 to meet requirements of the Women's Studies minor, you must submit a short proposal to the Women's Studies Steering Committee which spells out how this course satisfies requirements for WS courses. (See University Bulletin for details.)

COURSE OBJECTIVES: Students will explore rhetorical discourse in three areas: (1) rhetorical theory in which they will become familiar with components of the speech act; (2) rhetorical criticism which will allow students to develop a critical perspective of effective and ineffective, ethical and unethical uses of

rhetorical principles; and (3) practice of rhetorical skills, which allow students to apply rhetorical principles to their own writing and speech-making.

Specifically, students will be expected to:

1. Demonstrate knowledge of major methodologies for analyzing the spoken word, ranging from classical to contemporary theories;

2. Demonstrate the ability to analyze historical public discourse by writing four critical essays;

3. Demonstrate critical thought by analyzing the arguments, evidence, and patterns of reasoning of several public debates;

4. Demonstrate knowledge of style (including metaphor, literary and stylistic devices, etc.) by means of a close textual analysis;

5. Demonstrate the ability to conduct independent research in the area of the student's interest by means of a final rhetorical criticism;

6. Demonstrate an ability to defend his or her ideas before the class in a seminar format using the Socratic method of learning;

7. Demonstrate an understanding of the feminist perspective, and the implications of it's application to rhetorical criticism and the discourse of the American woman's suffrage movement;

8. Demonstrate improved skill in speech construction and presentation by reporting to the class on personal research and analysis, and:

9. Demonstrate familiarity with, and appreciation for original rhetorical texts as responses to their historical/rhetorical contexts.

COURSE OUTLINE:

Unit I: Classical Rhetorical Tradition 7 weeks

A. The nature and scope of rhetoric
   1. role of rhetorical criticism in formulating public policy
   2. role of rhetoric in a free society
   3. rationale for rhetorical criticism

4. constructs of critical analysis and perspective
5. role of situation
6. problems of asking questions and exercising critical judgment
7. establishing fair standards for judging discourse.

Reading Assignments: Read Ch. 1 in textbook (pp. 1-33), Bitzer's essay on "The Rhetorical Situation," and assigned handouts distributed in class. Written Assignment: 3-4 page analysis of current presidential speech as "fitting response" to an exigence in society. Due by last week of September.

B. Classical Rhetoric
1. The sophistic tradition/orality of Greek culture
2. Greek-Roman tradition
3. Isocrates
4. Plato
5. Aristotle
6. Cicero
7. Quintilian
8. St. Augustine

Assignments: Read Chs. 2-5 in text and articles on writings of classical rhetoricians; independent readings on one of the classical rhetoricians; Epideictic Report and Paper (each student will give a 15-20 minute report in-class to praise or blame the contributions of a classicial rhetorician to modern rhetoric); a typed 4-5 page rhetorical biography of the assigned classical rhetorician; analysis of argument/evidence/proofs in the Second Lincoln-Douglas Debate; Ch. 21 on Toulmin on argument; typed comparative analysis of the first Nixon-Kennedy debate in 1960 and the second Bush-Dukakis debate in 1988. (The 1960 and 1988 debates will be shown and discussed in class-details about assignment on attached sheets)

UNIT II: CONTEMPORARY RHETORICAL THEORY 7 weeks

A. Neo-Aristotelian Criticism
1. ethos, pathos, logos/nature of "proof"
2. five "canons" of rhetoric/parts of speech
3. deliberative, epideictic, forensic/"purposeful" speaking
4. political and religious discourse
5. determining "effect"

B. The "New" Rhetoric
   1. I.A. Richards, Richard Weaver on metaphor
   2. Studies on delivery
   3. Close textual analysis

Assignments: Read Chapters 10-12,14,15, and 16 in textbook; close textual analysis of Martin Luther King, Jr.'s "I Have A Dream Speech" (4-5 pages, typed).

C. Kenneth Burke: Rhetoric as Motive and Dramatism

Assignments: Read handout on "dramatism" by K.Burke, Chs. 18, 20, 23 in textbook and assigned articles by and about Burke.

D. Rhetoric of Mass Movements
   1. Griffith's essay on historical movements
   2. Bowers and Och's strategies/tactics of agitation and control in movements.
   3. Issues concerning text/contextual reconstruction

Assignments: Assigned readings from K.K. Campbell's book on early feminist orators; over view of history of American Woman's Suffrage Movement; proposal for Final Criticism; ROUGH DRAFTS OF THE PAPER WILL BE ACCEPTED UNTIL THANKSGIVING BREAK-take advantage of the opportunity to revise your paper based on the instructor's comments on the draft. Your final rhetorical criticism will be an 8-10 page research paper on one of the women orators of the American Woman's Suffrage Movement. (See attached sheet for details/possible subjects for your critical paper. Please note that the Wilkes Library staff prepared an instructional bibliography specifically for this assignment. The bibliography will contain listings of sources on the Suffrage Movement that are available at Wilkes, King's, or the Osterhout. It would appear that King's and the Osterhout have more sources than our own Farley Library. Because that is the case, and Wilkes wants to build it's holdings in women's studies, please include an annotated bibliography with your paper which should note the quality of various sources. If an important text is unavailable at Wilkes, I will order it.) Each student will also give a 15 minute summary of his/her final paper during the final examination period; final papers will be due on the day of the in-class report. There will be no extensions.

PLEASE NOTE THAT YOUR FINAL RHETORICAL CRITICISMS ON THE AMERICAN WOMAN'S SUFFRAGE MOVEMENT MAY BE SUBMITTED FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE SCA STUDENT SECTION OR THE PA STATE COMM. ASSOCIATION'S UNDERGRADUATE ESSAY COMPETITION. IF THE INSTRUCTOR AGREES, YOUR FINAL PAPER WILL BE SUBMITTED

TO SCA OR SCAP'S ESSAY COMPETITION. THE DEPARTMENT WILL HELP PAY SOME EXPENSES IF YOUR PAPER IS ACCEPTED FOR ONE OF THE CONVENTIONS--WE WANT TO ENCOURAGE OUR UPPER LEVEL STUDENTS TO CONDUCT RESEARCH, AND PRESENT IT BEFORE A CONVENTION AUDIENCE. IT WILL BE EXCELLENT PREPARATION FOR THOSE OF YOU WHO ARE GRADUATE SCHOOL BOUND.

SUMMARY OF COURSE REQUIREMENTS:

Analysis of current presidential speech	25 points
Epideictic report/paper on a classical rhetorician	75
Comparative analysis of argument in 1960 and 1988 debates	100
Close textual analysis of "I Have A Dream"	50
Final rhetorical criticism on American Woman's Suffrage Movement(8-10 page paper and 15 minute report)	200
In-class critiques and discussions	50

TOTAL POINTS POSSIBLE IN COURSE: 500 points

Your final course grade will be determined by the percentage earned of the possible 500 points. Feel free to stop by at any time to discuss your grade.

APPENDIX B

COM 300: Rhetorical Criticism
Jane Elmes-Crahall

PRESIDENT BUSH'S WAR ON DRUGS: A FITTING RESPONSE?

Today, September 5, 1989, the long-awaited presidential policy outline to combat drugs is to be released. President Bush will present his proposal in written form (to Congress and the media), and in the form of a speech to the American people. The speech will be televised at 10:00 P.M. on all networks and CNN.

It is important that you re-read Bitzer's essay on rhetorical situation before you watch the speech tonight, because our discussions will focus on situational factors inherent in the President's speech. The New York Times is likely to publish the complete text of the President's speech in the Sept. 6 or 7 editions. Make sure you get a copy of his speech. I will video tape the speech to make sure we have a copy of the speech as presented.

For the next week, as a seminar, we will be analyzing the presidential proposal to fight drugs from a situational perspective. Key terms to consider as you listen to the speech tonight:

(1) Exigence(s): What forces influenced President Bush? What problem(s) did he identify that provoked him to take action?

(2) Audience(s): As you listen to the speech, how would you characterize the audience the President is seeking to influence? Give examples of audience-directed cues. Will these audiences be competent and willing to change the exigencis regarding drugs?

(3) Constraints: What forces seem to limit the President's options in presenting his ideas?

(4) Controlling Exigence:

(5) Rhetorical situation: (defined as "a complex of persons, events, objects, and relations presenting an actual or potential exigence which can be completely or partially removed if discourse, introduced into the situation, can so constrain human decision or action as to bring about the significant modification of the exigence")

(6) "Fitting" Response: Was the President's speech a "fitting response?"

APPENDIX C

COM 300: Rhetorical Criticism
Jane Elmes-Crahall

EPIDEICTIC REPORTS AND PAPERS ON CLASSICAL RHETORICIANS

"Epideictic rhetoric," more commonly called ceremonial speaking, was defined by Aristotle in his Rhetoric. Aristotle defined this genre of speaking as "speech which seeks to praise or blame." He explains that ceremonial speech, as contrasted to political (deliberative) or judicial (forensic), deals with an audience of spectators, and calls upon the audience assembled in the present to hear a particular person or event "praised or blamed," as a response to "the noble and the shameful" in society. Kenneth Burke, a present-day rhetorical scholar, uses the term "identification" to describe the rapport a speaker builds with an audience in order to "form a community of minds." An epideictic speaker can do more than praise or blame--he or she can intensify an adherence to particular values (pride,pity,guilt,patriotism,etc.); create a disposition to act (to want to be mor respectful, to empathize with someone's experiences; to alter expectations about a person or event); and to bring people to act (demonstrate anger or dissatisfaction; give money or gifts; vote).

Each of you will be assigned a classical rhetorician to study, read about, and to praise or blame in a 15-20 minute speech which will be accompanied by a 4-5 page typed rhetorical biography. The central question you will address in the epideictic speech/paper is: "SHOULD THE MODERN STUDENT OF RHETORIC PRAISE OR BLAME (seek to emulate or reject) THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE CLASSICAL FIGURE FOR HIS CONTRIBUTIONS TO OUR FIELD OF STUDY? Remember-you are seeking to move members of this class (as audience to your epideictic rhetoric) in 1989 to act in a particular way towards teachings of a classical rhetorician. Look for ways to connect the writings with our needs.

Schedule/Assignment of Epideictic Reports on Classical Rhetoricians:

Sept. 25	Isocrates (est. 436-338 B.C.) Read: "Against the Sophists" and "Antidosis"	1. _____
	Plato (427-347 B.C.) Read: "Gorgias"-attack on rhetoric, dialogue/dialectic as ways of knowing	2. _____
	"Phaedrus"-Plato's use of rhetoric and his influence	3. _____
Sept. 28	Aristotle-the scientific approach to rhetoric Read from the Rhetoric: Book I (Scope of Rhetoric)	4. _____
	Book II (Ethos/Emotion),	5. _____
	Book III (Delivery)	6. _____

Oct. 3	Demosthenes (est. 330 B.C.) Read: "On the Crown"	7. _____
	Cicero Read: "De Inventione" and "Orator"	8. _____
	Cicero Read: "De Oratore" and his relationship with Isocrates	9. _____
Oct. 5	Quintilian -Institution Oratorio and "Good Man" theory	10. _____
	Longinus (?)-"On the Sublime"	11. _____
	St. Augustine-primarily Book IV and Introduction of "De Doctrina Chistiana"--preaching	12. _____

Your papers are due the day you give your epideictic speech in class.

COM 300: Rhetorical Criticism
Jane Elmes-Crahall

MEETING OF THE GREAT RHETORICAL MINDS: THE ETHICS OF RHETORIC

As a seminar, we will be discussing the following questions today. But before we begin the discussion, take a few minutes to determine how the classical rhetorician you studied would respond. Look over your epideictic papers and speak in the spirit of your rhetorician.

(1) Is there a difference between telling the truth and being honest?

(2) How much information constitutes the truth in a given situation? Are there situations that warrant withholding information?

(3) Is telling the truth the goal of contemporary public address in politics, education, religion, advertising, broadcasting, etc.?

(4) Quintilian stated "an orator is a morally good man skilled in speaking." Is there a particular life-style (home, school, etc.) that is more likely to encourage the development of such persons? Is Quintilian's statement masking an elitist viewpoint of leadership, or a selective attitude about who might become a leader?

(5) Does the end (truth) justify the rhetorical means used by the speaker? Cite at least one historical or present-day example to support your answer.

REMINDER: Next time we begin the analysis of political debates, so read the second Lincoln-Douglas Debate on reserve in the library and bring your flow sheets of the arguments.